



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,718	02/20/2004	William A. McCarty	KSCIL007CP2	5600
29995 7590 07/28/2010 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614				
EXAMINER				
LAO, LUN S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2614				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/28/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com

efiling@kmob.com

eOAPilot@kmob.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/783,718	MCCARTY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LUN-SEE LAO	2614	

All Participants:

(1) LUN-SEE LAO

(2) Vivian Chin

Date of Interview: 21 July 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Status of Application: _____

(3) Mr. James F. Herkenheff

(4) Mr. Kenny Qinlei Wang

Time: Eastern Time 1:00 pm

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

103 rejection

Claims discussed:

claim 47

Prior art documents discussed:

Yasuhara (US PAT. 7,190,798) and Swix et al. (us 2004/0250273)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Discussed the limitation of claim 47 of this application, and the prior art to Yasuhara and Swix et.al. Mr. Wang explained the invention of the claim and its novelty. The examiner discussed how the claim was interpreted in the prior art and suggested amendments to the claims. Non agreement was reached

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Vivian Chin/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)